

REMARKS

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated October 20, 2009. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112. In that regard, parent Claim 1 has now been amended to point out that the catalyst represents the compounds of formula (I) or (II). These formulas are specifically stated at pages 3 and 7 of the Specification.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-10 over Fisher U.S. 6,197,992. It was understood from the last paragraph of Item 4 on page 4 of the Office Action that if Claim 1 were amended to incorporate the catalyst as now amended such amendment would overcome the rejection over Fisher.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims on the ground of double patenting. Attached hereto is a Terminal Disclaimer which should obviate the double patenting rejection.

In view of the above remarks and amendments this application should now be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Harold Pezzner

Registration No.: 22,112
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant